

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

NICHOLAS S. ROY,

Plaintiff,

v.

VICTORIA BARSHAW, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C06-5296FDB

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO COMPEL AND
PRETRIAL SCHEDULE

The matter comes before the court on plaintiff's motion to continue discovery (Doc. 25), plaintiff's motion to compel discovery (Doc. 29), and a additional motion to compel discovery (Doc. 32). After considering these motions, opposition to the motions, and Plaintiff's reply briefing, the court finds and orders as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's motion to continue discovery is **GRANTED**. The current discovery deadline (March 1, 2007) has past, and it appears an extension of time is warranted to allow the parties to have a full opportunity to complete the discovery process. Accordingly, all further discovery shall be completed by **May 1, 2007**. The serving party, therefore, must serve his/her interrogatories at least thirty (30) days before this deadline in order to allow the other party time to answer in a timely manner. Dispositive motion shall be filed and served on or before **June 15, 2007**. Counsel and *pro se* parties are directed to confer and provide the court with the joint status report by no later than **September 15, 2007**.

(2) Plaintiff's motions to compel (Docs 29 & 32) are **DENIED**. Plaintiff complains that the

1 answers to his discovery requests included inappropriate objections and irrelevant information. After
2 reviewing the pleadings, the court finds defendants have responded appropriately to each of the underlying
3 discovery requests. Plaintiff should note that discovery is an ongoing process, thus if Defendants become
4 aware of any further information or documentation that is responsive, they have a duty to disclose such
5 information.

6 DATED this 20th day of March, 2007.

7
8 /s/ J. Kelley Arnold

9 J. Kelley Arnold

10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28